DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 070 HE 022 090

AUTHOR Nerad, Maresi
TITLE The Vicious Cycle of Gender and Status at the University of California at Berkeley, 1918-1954. ASHE 1988 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (St. Louis, MO, November 3-6, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *Departments; Employed Women; Employment Level; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Higher Education; *Home Economics Education; Prestige; Professional Recognition; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Stereotypes; Status; *Women Faculty
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *University of California Berkeley

ABSTRACT

The way in which an all-women's department, the Department of Home Economics at the University of California (Berkeley), tried to raise its status and adhere to academic values of a research university after starting out as a low prestige undergraduate program is analyzed. Some of the related research questions are: whether academic departments within coeducational universities intended mostly to serve women (such as education, library science, women's physical education, hygiene, nursing, and home economics) automatically start out low in status, power, and prestige; whether their status rises or falls over time; and how they sustain their existence. Focus was on the following: Agnes Fay Morgan, the female institution builder (a PhD in chemistry who became chair of the household science division of the department, reorganized it into an independent department, and tried to raise the status of her department); hiring of faculty; building a curriculum; research activities; space and research facilities; changing the name of the department; the graduate group in nutrition; visibility; and gender and status. It is noted that gender and status form a vicious circle, and that gender played a crucial role during the life of the Department of Home Economics at the University of California at Berkeley. The case demonstrates how significant gender is as a factor in ranking academic departments. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303070

THE VICIOUS CYCLE OF GENDER AND STATUS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

1918-1954

MARESI NERAD

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE022090

ASHE
ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Adam's Mark Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri, November 3-6, 1988. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

THE VICIOUS CYCLE OF GENDER AND STATUS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY 1918-1954

MARESI NERAD

Saul Feldman, in his book Escape from the Doll's House: Women in Graduate and Professional School Education (1974), demonstrated that, as in female-dominated occupations, female-dominated academic disciplines are low in prestige, low in economic rewards, and low in power. Although he described the characteristics of "masculine" and "feminine" academic disciplines, he did not explain why they had these different characteristics or indicate whether and how such departments resist this characterization.

Organization theory under the concept of institutional hierarchy examines the phenomenon of institutional status. Martin Trow in "Higher Education as a Stratification System: The Analysis of Status,"[1] surveyed the factors which cause high or low status and prestige in academic systems. He named such factors as the quality of its faculty, effectiveness of its program, career choices and employment of its students, research awards of the faculty, service on important campus committees, and support both from the administration and related departments. At research

---

1 Martin Trow, "Analysis of Status," in Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views, ed. Burton Clark (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 132-164.

universities the resulting aggregate research reputation of the department contributes most importantly to the department's prestige. These are also the criteria used for assessing the ranking of a college or university in America. Trow pointed out that status plays an unusually strong role in academic systems, "replacing money as the primary coin of exchange."[2] Neither his study nor any other study on ranking academic departments has, however, paid attention to the issue of gender in assessing departmental status and prestige, wealth, power, and influence.[3] This is in contrast with Feldman's findings.

Research Questions

Do academic departments within coeducational univeristies which were intended mostly to serve women such as education, library science, women's physical education, hygiene, nursing, and home economics automatically start out low in status, power, and prestige? Does their status rise or fall over time? And if so, how do they sustain their existence? These are the questions which motivated this research.

---

2 *Ibid.*

3 See also Allan Cartter, An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966); Judith K. Lawrence and Kenneth C. Green, A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game, AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No. 5 (Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1980); Rebecca Zames Margulies and Peter Blau, "The Pecking Order of the Elite, America's Leading Professional Schools," Change, November 1973, pp. 21-32?; David Webster, "America's Highest Ranked Graduate Schools, 1925-1982," Change, May/June 1983, pp. 14-24.

This study analyzes how an all-women's department, the Department of Home Economics at UC Berkeley, tried to raise its status and adhere to academic values of a research university, after starting out as a low prestige undergraduate program.

Home Economics at Berkeley Started out with Low Status

As I have shown elsewhere, Home Economics was introduced at Berkeley between 1905 and 1916 as an administrative strategy to isolate the many women students enrolling in the College of Letters and Science and minimize their competition with men.[4] At the same time it was a way of preparing women students for what was seen as their ultimate vocation that of wives and mothers. Women, however, inside and outside the university, promoted home economics in an entirely different spirit. They wanted the subject to be introduced and developed in such a way as to broaden women's employment opportunities. They therefore wanted the University to establish a School of Home Economics with five subdivisions, each one addressing the problems of Food, Clothing, Housing, Household Administration, and Household Education. Unfortunately their aims were distorted and never fully realized.

---

4 Nerad, Maresi, "Coping with Women Students - Women Coping with the University: "The Origins of the University of California's Department of Home Economics 1905-1915," History of Education Society: Leicester, England. Occasional Publication Number 8, 1987, pp.21-36.

Home Economics at the University of California Berkeley was officiallay established by the administration in 1916 as as a liberal arts undergraduate program, consisting of a houshold science and a household art division. Department of Home Economics within the College of Letters and Science. As such it had little autonomy and was low in status and in prestige.

Agnes Fay Morgan: The Female Institution Builder

In 1918, an extraordinary woman, Agnes Fay Morgan, a Ph.D. in chemistry from the University of Chicago, became chair of the household science division of the Department and reorganized this section into an independent department of Household Science, which was latter called Home Economics Department. Agnes Fay Morgan distinctly shaped the identity of this department as its chair for 36 years, from 1918 till 1954. With every conceivable means she tried to raise the status of her department.

The main problem which home economics programs around the country, such as those at the Universities of Chicago, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania State, Columbia University, Teachers College, and also at Berkeley had to face, was that they had to answer to the practical demands coming from the state, and simultaneously adhere to the scientific standards of the academic community at their campuses. They developed two

strategies to overcome their reputation of being a trade school department: One, they overloaded the curriculum with science requirements, hoping to increase the academic respectability of the program. Second, they hired mainly women doctorates to teach the subjects as rigorously as possible.[5]

The Berkeley Department, under tight control by Agnes Fay Morgan, developed several other additional strategies: It linked itself to other "more respectable" departments, such as Biochemistry and Physiology, by participating in the formation of an interdepartmental graduate group in nutrition. Professor Morgan became director of this group in 1946. The Department, specifically its chair, Agnes Fay Morgan tried to bring visibility to the Department and to herself by participating in the campus administration as much as possible. She also sought and got a larger and more prominent space on campus than the temporary war building that housed the Household Science Department from 1916-1930. She and the other members of the Department participated in many national and international conferences. Thus they made the department known outside of California and established a good reputation for it in the professional field. As chair, Agnes Fay Morgan developed ties to agriculture and food

---

5 For more information see Marie Dye, History of the Department of Home Economics, Univeristy of Chicago, Chocago: Home Economics Alumni Association, 1972; and Margaret Rossiter, Women Scientists in America: Struggles and Strategies to 1940, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1982, p.201.

industry groups in California and lobbied them for financial support during the days of limited resource allocation by the University. The Department also tried several times to change its name into human nutrition, both to reflect more properly the work it did and to rid itself of an image which invariably associated the Department with vocational work, of low academic quality, and with being just a women's department which prepared women "with rule-of-thumb recipes for gracious living."[6] Dr. Morgan seemed to have taken into account most of the criteria which Trow found to influence status and prestige in academic systems.

Hiring of Faculty

In 1918, when Household Science became a separate division within the Department in Home Economics, its faculty consisted of five members: two Assistant Professors, Dr. Morgan and Josephine Davis (Wharton); one Instructor, Anna Williams; and two Assistants, Alice Metcalf and Elizabeth Bridge. Only Agnes Fay Morgan held a Ph.D. degree. This situation changed drastically once the Department became independent. Of the thirteen members who were employed in the Household Science Department between 1920 and 1938, eleven held a Ph.D. degree from such universities as Berkeley, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Illinois, Iowa, Yale, and Washington (see Table I). Four of

6 Ruth Okey, Barbara Kennedy Johnson, Gordon Mackinney, "Agnes Fay Morgan, 1884-1968," In Memoriam (Berkeley, University of California, 1969). p.79.

Table I: Faculty of the Department of Household Science, 1916-1938

Time	Title	Degree	University	Name	Years at Berkeley
1913-1915	Instructor**	M.A.	Columbia	Josephine Davis	
1916-18	Asst. Prof				
1915-19	Asst. Prof.	Ph.D.	Chicago	Agnes Fay Morgan	39
1919-22	Assoc. Prof.				
1923-54	Professor				
1917-18	Lab. Ass.	M.S.		Edith Brown	1
1918-20	Instructor	M.A.	Illinois	Anna Williams	2
1918-19	Assistant	A.B		Alice Metcalf	1
1918-19	Assistant	M.A.		Elizabeth Bridge	1
1919-20/21	Asst. Prof	Ph.D.	Illinois	Ruth Okey	38
1922-25	Asst. Prof				
1926-43	Assoc. Prof				
1944-60	Professor				
1920-21	Assistant	A.B.		Anita Lassen	1
1921-23	Instructor	Ph.D.	Yale	Icie Macy	2
1922-24	Assistant	M.A.	UCB	Lillias Francis	2
1923-26	Instructor	Ph.D.	Columbia	Lucille Johnson	5
1926-28	Asst. Prof.				
1923-24	Assit. Prof.	Ed.D.	Harvard	Sarah H. Bridge	1
1928-30	Asst. Prof.	Ph.D.	Chicago	Sybil Woodruff	2
1930-33(34)*	Asst. Prof	Ph.D.	Iowa	Florence Armstrong	3
1935-36	Instructor	Ph.D.	UCB	Helen Gilum	23
1936-45	Asst. Prof				
1945-56	Assoc. Prof				
1957-58	Professor				
1932-35	Instructor	Ph.D.	Cornell	Irene Sanborn Hall	3
1935	Instructor	Ph.D.		Ada Field	1
1936-40	Instructor	Ph.D.	Washington	Betty Monaghan	8
1941-44	Asst. Prof.				

* on forced sabbatical leave in 1934
** taught only during Summer Sessions

Source: Annual or biennual reports of the Department of Household Science to the President, 1918, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1923, 1924, 1930-31, 1932-33, 1933-34, 1934-36; Course Catalogues 1918-1936

them were hired as Assistant Professors, six as Instructors of which two later became Assistant Professors, and two were Assistants. Only the two Assistants who stayed each for one and two years respectively had no Ph.Ds. Among the instructors was Icy Macy (Hoobler), a Yale graduate who became a nationally known nutritionist. She left Berkeley to head the nutrition research project at the Merill-Palmer School of Detroit. Later, she directed nutrition research at the Children's Fund of Michigan.[7]

This impressive number of Ph.D. instructors showed that Dr. Morgan understood how important the quality of the faculty was for the status of a department. However she undermined her own strategy by failing to develop loyalty among her own junior staff. Thus, there was a high turnover between 1920 and 1938. Besides Professor Morgan, only four of the twelve women employed in the Department of Household Science during this time stayed longer than four years.

Building a Curriculum

From the very beginning of her appointment at Berkeley Professor Morgan pursued another strategy: building an extremely "scientific" curriculum based on fundamental science principles. But in pursuing these curricular ideas she ran into a structural bind. With Berkeley being a

7 Icie Gertrude Macy Hoobler, Boundless Horizons, Portrait of a Pioneer Woman Scientist (New York: Exposition Press, 1982).

public state university, the California State Department of Education requested from the Department teacher training for the high schools and service for the state's needs. Ruth Okey, a professor in Berkeley Home Economics Department from 1919 until 1960, recalled:

> In the early years in Letters and Science, she [Morgan] had to deal on the one hand with university administrators, such as President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, who were strongly oriented toward high academic standards and had little respect for home economics, and, on the other hand, with a state Department of Education which demanded teachers trained in the practical aspects of home cooking and sewing, and dietitians who could deal with problems of quantity cookery and food management as well as therapeutic dietetics.[8]

However Dr. Morgan would not compromise.

> So I would not compromise on the stern scientific foundation for all work in nutrition, although I think this department as I developed it is the only one in the country that has stuck by that. Most home economics departments which develop nutrition have nutrition departments, and some of them have very well-advanced research programs too. But, for the general run of the students they did not demand very much in the way of scientific basis.
>
> We demand general chemistry, organic chemistry, biochemistry, physiology, bacteriology, and quantitative analysis, and of course, statistics.[9]

---

8 Ruth Okey, "Agnes Fay Morgan (1884-1968) - A Biographical Sketch," The Journal of Nutrition, 104, No.9, (Sept. 1974), p.1103

9 Agnes Fay Morgan, Oral History Interview; interviewed aby Alexander Callow, Regional Oral History Project, University of California Archives, The Bancroft Library, Berkeley, 1959, p.21-22.

Keeping the home economics curriculum on a strong scientific base became a permanent struggle throughout her 36 years as chair of the Department. She recalled:

> But all aspect of that subject [home economics] do not lead themselves to that treatment and I found it increasingly difficult to maintain a high type of scholarship with solid research background for all parts of this department that the teacher trainers wanted us to maintain.[10]

Also outside her own department she became known for her high standards. In many of her articles she pleaded for a science-based curriculum, and scolded other home economics departments that "the 'pure' sciences have so hastily become applied sciences that little but the applications seem to have survived."[11] She very sharply dismissed any "watered-down" version of a home economics curriculum.

> Indeed, the cooking, table setting, and routine calculations are in my opinion wholly unnecessary except as they offer illustration of principles or even comic relief. Students can be interested in both scientific and social concepts through the vital avenue of human nurture, often spelled nutrition.[12]

In the Journal of Home Economics she spelled out that a professional curriculum in home economics should be divided

---

10 *Ibid.*, p.11.
11 Agnes Fay Morgan, "High School Courses in Science of the Household, Nutrition, and Citizen-Homemaking," The School Review, 1, No.24 (May 1927), p.521; A. F. Morgan, "Home Economics Courses and the Higher Institutions of Learning," The School Review, 28, No.7 (Sept. 1920), A. F. Morgan, "Let's Consider Home Economics," Omicron Nu, 3, No.40 Winter 1947.
12 Agnes Fay Morgan, "A New Look for the Old-Fashioned Liberal Education of Women," American Association University Professors Bulletin, 39, No. 2 (Summer 1953), p.261-262.

into three components with at least sixty percent devoted to the foundation disciplines, ten percent to the home economics core, and the rest thirty percent to general education.[13] Every article written in memory of her mentioned her efforts in establishing a scholarly curriculum.[14]

In fact, Professor Morgan went to the other extreme. She overcompensated, as others did in similar situations, by requiring that home economics students take additional courses that would increase their academic respectability.

> Candidates for teaching credentials found themselves prepared to teach (and often did teach) basic science courses, rather than the traditional cooking and sewing in high school.[15]

Some teacher training students complained and the administration criticized the Department for being too rigorous in its requirements. Monroe Deutsch, Dean of the University and later Provost of the Faculty from 1930-47, wrote to Dr. Morgan:

> Some time ago my attention was called to certain aspects of your course Household Science 120. I am informed that the course itself is felt to be of great value to those taking it, it is included as one of the absolute requirements for the major in Household Science.
>
> In addition to the regular work in the course (lectures and laboratory work which always take

---

13 Agnes Fay Morgan, "Professional Training the Major Concern," The Journal of Home Economics, 43, No.4 (April 1951), p. 253-256.
14 The Iotan Newsletter, No. 34, Nov. 1983; Nutrition Research, 22, No.1 (October 1968); The Journal of Nutrition, suppl.Part II, 91, No.2 (Feb. 1967).
15 Okey, Johnson, Mackinney, *op.cit.*, p. 79.

> more time than the amount supposedly required), I have been informed that an additional rat problem [undertaking a research problem which required work on rats] is demanded of the students; indeed two such problems were demanded. This is, I am informed, beside the regular laboratory work. I am informed that during the course of the semester this problem will probably take 150 hours beside the amount which the students have a right to expect. ... There is a limit to what a student can do.... I think the matter should be given careful consideration by you and your colleagues.[16]

At the 40th graduation reunion of the class of 1947, former home economics students, when asked about their extracurricular life on campus, unanimously replied that they had no time for any other activities but attending classes and feeding rats for their research projects.[17]

One would think that this heavy emphasis on fundamental science would have brought the department high recognition from the University administration and acceptance by neighboring disciplines and departments. However this was not the case. The service-orientation and the emphasis on teacher training mandated by the state meant that members of the academic community at Berkeley held an image of the department as if it were a "trade school department." Therefore home economics constantly had to legitimize and defend its academic standards.

Research Activities

16 Letter of Monroe Deutsch, Provost of the Faculty, to Dr. Morgan, March 22, 1937.
17 I participated in the 40th anniversary of the home economics class of 1945, held at Berkeley in May 1985.

Even the many research projects undertaken by the members of the Department did little to diminish that image. In the eyes of the rest of the campus, it was applied research, research which did not push into frontiers of pure science, meaning "pure in the sense of lacking immediate applicability to already recognized problems."[18] It was research which concerned itself with the needs of women, children and the family, and these research topics did not bring status and prestige with them.

Professor Doris Calloway, in her 21st Lenna Frances Cooper Memorial Lecture at the Annual Meeting of the American Dietetic Association in Anaheim in 1983, presented an analysis of historical and contemporary research contributions by women and men in the field of nutrition. She found that there existed a gender difference between researchers' concerns: "Men explore problems; women study needs."[19] She explained that "women were the principal investigators of nutrition concerns of women and children, for reasons of access and gentility."[20] Women in nutrition found entry into the field via a Ph.D. in chemistry and employment in home economics. They fostered their research through cooperation with the agricultural experiment

---

18 The various engineering programs at Berkeley did not have a particular low status.
19 Doris Howes Calloway, "21st Lenna Frances Cooper Memorial Lecture: Nutrition research by and about women," Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 84, No.6 (June 1984), p. 642.
20 *Ibid.*

stations. Men in the field usually also came from chemistry, but remained in chemistry or related fields such as physiological chemistry, biochemistry, physiology, and sometimes medicine. Few women therefore had the opportunity to do "pure" research, because they had to stay within the limits of their department boundaries. Their most readily available subjects for study were women, and the resources available to them were earmarked for studies to improve the condition of women, children, and the home. During the same period men's research interests were related to farm animals, or if to human beings, to principally clinical problems, such as hazards of obesity and anatomical defects due to rickets, and the like.[21] This gendered choice of research topics was also present at Berkeley.

Dr. Morgan's first research projects resulted from needing something to teach. Since she was brought to Berkeley "to do something practical for the preparation of dietitians," and since there was very little in books on nutrition, she set up her first vitamin research projects.[22] These early projects dealt with the nutrients of California food and what happened to food values as a result of processing. She was concerned with the effects of heat treatment on the nutritional efficiency of proteins of

---

21 *Ibid*, p.644 and 647.
22 Morgan, "Oral History," *op.cit.*, p.9.

wheat, almonds, and walnuts and pressured-cooked meat.[23] These projects attacked very practical problems of food processing in the household. Men in nutrition at that time, as Professor Jaffa, concentrated on animal feeds and on commercial products.

Altogether, during her career Dr. Morgan undertook research in three main areas: in human nutrition, animal nutrition, and in food technology. In the field of human nutrition she was the first to observe the effect of a commonly used food preservative, sulfur dioxide, on the vitamin content. She found that sulfur dioxide had a protective effect on vitamin C and a damaging effect on thiamine. She also tried to solve the problem of underweight children. This concern lead to studies on the effect of small supplementary feedings, such as fruits, milk, wheat germs, on the growth of school children. All of these studies were published in professional journals such as The American Journal of Diseases of Children.

She undertook research in animal nutrition because animals can be more readily controlled under laboratory conditions than can human subjects. But the results were to be applied to the improvement of human nutrition. Using

---

23 See more details on Morgan's research in her curriculum vitae; Okey, "Morgan," op.cit.; Okey, Johnson, Mackinney, op.cit; The Faculty Bulletin of the University of California, 1950, p. 41-42; Edna Southmayd, "Careers in Nutrition," Nutrition Research, 22, No. 1 (October 1968), pp. 1-4.

various kinds of animals -- first rats, latter guinea pigs, hamsters, and cocker spaniel dogs -- she analyzed the relationships between vitamin and hormone activities. Her work on dietary calcium and phosphorus vitamin D, and the parathyroid gland demonstrated the danger of giving babies excessive amounts of vitamin D. Many of these findings went unnoticed except for a report in a scientific journal, only to be rediscovered years later.

Her more "basic" research brought her the most recognition, although only ten years after her findings became known. In 1939, she detected that pantothenic acid, a vitamin B, was essential for adrenal function and for normal pigmentation of hair and skin. In this study she found that the fur of the black rats began to turn grey due to the adrenal damage because the rat diet lacked the vitamin B complex. For research in these basic areas she received the prestigious Garvan Medal of the American Chemical Society in 1949, and the Borden Award from the American Institute of Nutrition in 1954. This was the year of her retirement, when she was 70 years of age. An earlier national recognition would have certainly alleviated much of her struggle on her home campus. Rossiter also noted that "these early women winners were highly deserving of their awards, but also that they should have received them years earlier."[24]

---

24 Rossiter, *op.cit.*, p.288.

In the area of food technology, she co-authored a 414 page textbook, Experimental Food Study, in 1938 with Irene Sanborn Hall, one of her short term colleagues and personal friend. She analyzed the vitamin A content of citrus fruit juices, the vitamin A and B changes in canning artichokes, in tomatoes during ripening -- which then related to picking practices --and the possibility of enriching flour with vitamins. Choosing problems of sufficient interest to California's agriculture and industry she made it possible to receive outside support for research in the days when university resources were limited. However, many university administrator considered this tainted research, "not only for its service orientation but also for its seeming triviality."[25]

For example, in 1934, the Board of Research at Berkeley was concerned about Dr. Morgan's frequent work for industry and complained that this kind of work did not involve real research. On the other hand it understood the Department's need for money. Professor Armin Leuschner, then chairman of the Board of Research, reported to Provost Deutsch about the Board's concerns:

> After careful consideration of the propriety of the tests on bread and milk for the National Oil Products Company and the proposed tests on milk for the Arden Gold Seal Farms, Inc. we recommend that the new tests be undertaken for a limited time only, to give Mrs. Morgan an opportunity "to

25 Rossiter, *op.cit.*, p.200.

> make a comparison as to biological value and constancy of vitamin content" of the products of the two companies, and that the milk and bread tests for both the National Oil Products Company and the Arden Seal Farms, Inc., be discontinued on June 30, 1935. ...
>
> We are appreciative of the fact that her departmental and research budget have been severely cut and that these tests furnish funds and at the same time give employment to young women who have been trained in the University. These reasons, however, do not appear to us to be sufficient to answer the criticisms which we would invite by continuing such tests except in cases involving real research projects.[26]

Dr. Morgan never allowed these set-backs to interfere seriously in her work. Up till her retirement she had published about 200 papers, one text-book, and 77 review articles. After her retirement she wrote about 40 more papers and summarized the results of the nutritional status of older people in California, a longitudinal study which started in 1938. She also reviewed and collated 179 publications on this subjects by all the US Experiment Stations in the publication Nutritional Status USA in 1957.

Although Dr. Morgan might have been the most prolific researcher and writer of articles in her department, she was not the only one. Ruth Okey and Hellen Gillum and many of their graduate students produced valuable research and publications in Journals such as the Journal of the American Chemical Society, the American Journal of Physiology, the

---

26 Letter of A. Leuschner to Provost Deutsch, Oct. 10, 1934.

Journal of Biological Chemistry, or the Journal of Nutrition.

Perhaps Dr. Okey became less well known because her research topics were even more related to women than those of Agnes Fay Morgan. She studied the monthly changes in the metabolism of women during their menstrual cycles. This study involved determining basal metabolic rate, and analysis of blood and urine. She used graduate students from her Department and women students from physical education as research subjects and as assistants. In an essay about her experience as a women scientist at Berkeley, written in 1981 she remembered that this research project was written up in the San Francisco Chronicle by a "facetious editor," under the heading "A tablespoon of blood for your breakfast."[27] Lipid metabolism was a study area which she continued until her retirement in 1961. Most of it was also done on rats and other laboratory animals. About 50 publications resulted from this research area. Some aspects of this study led to the research on cholesterol and lecithin. She made cholesterol a well known word in Berkeley, long before it became known world-wide.[28]

---

27 Ruth Okey, "Experiences of a Women Trained in Science in the Years Preceding the Formation of the Present Department of Nutritional Sciences at UC Berkeley, 1981, p.11.
28 Emerson, *op.cit.*, p.2.

During the Depression she was involved in finding "an adequate diet at low cost."[29] She participated in the Heller Committee of the University of California which priced budgets for families at various income levels and analyzed the nutritive value of diets at various costs for the State of California. In 1941, together with the famous Berkeley Professor of Social Economics, Emily Huntington, she was appointed to serve on President Roosevelt's' First Nutrition Congress. She has over 100 publications and various reviews.

However, she never became as recognized as Dr. Morgan. Partly this might be caused by her specific research topics, partly by her less domineering personality, and partly by the overall poor research condition within the Department. Dr. Morgan, as chair of the Department, had the advantage of having the first choice in the allocation of the limited resource funds.

And yet, the Department produced respectable results. For example, in the year of 1933 alone, the four members of the staff published thirteen scientific articles. Dr. Morgan motto that "in every home economics division of colleges and universities an active effective research

---

29 Okey, "Experience," *op.cit.*, p.14.

program shall dominate," was certainly upheld in her own department.[30]

Space and Research Facilities

In 1919, when Dr. Okey came to Berkeley she was shocked by the poor research facilities of the Department. She came from the Department of Biochemistry at the University of Illinois, one of the best equipped departments in the country at that time.

> Opportunity for graduate teaching and research were very limited. Our first animal quarters consisted of two packing boxes nailed to the back of our "temporary" frame building. They housed two white rabbits. They were joined later on by another packing box -- this one in the basement of the building. It was inhabited by a family of mice contributed by Dr. Sundstroem of Biochemistry, as part of a study of the effect of climate on food consumption and needs. My research budget of $250 was considered generous.[31]

The San Francisco Chronicle, a local newspaper, even reported about the inadequate research space.

> It requires brawn as well as brain to be an instructor in the household science department at the University of California," declare Dr. Lucille Johnson, Dr. Agnes Fay Morgan, and Dr. Ruth Okey, heads of that department on the Berkeley campus. Due to the present fire hazard in the wooden structure which serves as the department's headquarter, the instructors, it was learned yesterday, must carry home each night their records and research results as a precautionary measure.[32]

The article was accompanied by a picture showing the three women carrying heavy satchels.

---

30 Morgan, "Undergraduate and Graduate Preparation," *op.cit.*, p.686.
31 Okey, "Experiences," *op.cit.* p.8.
32 San Francisco Chronicle, Tuesday, October 19, 1926.

In 1930, when the construction of the new Life Science Building was completed, the Department of Household Science finally moved into a permanent building. However, there also the research conditions were still inadequate.

> The Department of Household Science had moved to the Life Science Building in 1930/31, with offices and teaching labs on the northwest basement floor and animal quarters on the southeast corner of the fifth floor. Our space in Life Sciences proved to be poorly adapted for our Nutrition work. It was crowded, dark impossible to keep clean, and generally cheerless. My research lab was 50 feet long mostly underground, and had one window. Our much desired animal quarters were badly planned. The unplastered title partitions were soon alive with various types of vermin -- including bedbugs from the shavings used for animal bedding and lice from the swallows who nested in the fifth floor cornices. Ventilation was poor and it was almost impossible to regulate temperature in the south rooms. Our original rat colonies lived in round cages homemade from hardware cloth and set on squares of hardware cloth over tin cake pans on metal shelving originally designed for books....Regular janitors refused to work in the animal rooms.... Cages had to be washed in sinks and there was no provision for sterilization, other than soap and water.33

Compared to the present it is amazing that the department was able to do laboratory research at all. It was not only space which was lacking, but also equipment. The department members depended on other departments for the use of many instruments. They could use the microtome, a much needed instrument for making fine slices of objects for the microscope, only when other departments did not use it themselves. Because of lack of money, time and equipment,

---

33 Okey, "Experiences," *op.cit.*, p.16

Dr. Okey was forced in 1942 to cease her work on guinea pigs for a period of more than ten years.[34]

Agnes Fay Morgan also remembered the bad research conditions. As department chair she protested against them forcefully. In her closing remarks at the Symposium in 1965, honoring her 50th anniversary at Berkeley, she told the audience about these early days of trouble.

> My first troubles were budgetary. A tight-fisted board of research gave us $600 one year for the research of the department and I considered this a remarkable windfall. However, I found later that they had given the Chemistry Department $13,000 for their research. This I considered obviously unfair. I think no one would agree with me then or now.[35]

The fight for space, laboratory equipment, and research money, is not only a problem of women and of home economics departments. Space is a symbol of power. Those members of the academic community who have more status are more likely to be successful in acquiring needed space than those who are less well respected.

Agnes Fay Morgan conscious about status and prestige, also wanted space. In 1944, Dr. Morgan managed to include a plan for a separate home economics building in the State building program; th plan in fact was adopted by the Legislature the same year. Five years later, in 1949, the

---

Ibid., p.19.
35 Morgan, "Closing Remarks," *op.cit.*, p.65.

detailed plans for the building were completed and construction was scheduled to begin, but due "to some oversight the funding had been delayed."[36] So far, no further information on this delay had been found. In 1950, funds were appropriated, but because of the Korean conflict all construction was stopped. In 1952, finally, permission was granted for the building. In 1954, the year Dr. Morgan retired, a 4-story building on the northwest end of the campus was completed. After ten years of waiting the Department could finally move into its own space. Ironically, half a year later, the Educational Policy Committee of the Academic Senate at Berkeley, recommended that the Department be moved to the Davis campus.[37]

But the new comfortable four-story building came too late to raise the Department's prestige. On the contrary, the seven-room penthouse on the roof designed for home management practice, brought the Department the reputation of teaching "bed making."[38]

---

36 Agnes Fay Morgan, "History of the Department of Nutritional Sciences," June 23, 1965, p.4.
37 The detailed story and analysis of the events in the 1950s is beyond the scope of this work. For more information see Maresi Nerad, "Gender Stratification in Higher Education: The Department of Home Economics at the University of California, Berkeley 1916-1962," Women's Studies International Forum, 10, No.2, (1987), pp.157-164.
38 Personal interview with President Clark Kerr, March 1985.

Name Change

Dr. Morgan tried to stretch the departmental boundaries very far: for some faculty members on the Berkeley campus, too far. She wanted to change the name of the Department from Household Science to Human Nutrition. In 1924, she inquired about the possibility with President William Campbell. Campbell, a professor of astronomy, was favorable to the proposal. His only concern was some possible conflict with the Department of Nutrition in the College of Agriculture, run by Professor Jaffa. However, Professor Jaffa had no objections since the Nutrition Department in Agriculture concerned itself with animal nutrition. Also the Dean of the College of Agriculture had no objections and wrote to President Campbell:

> There is no objection on the part of Professor Jaffa or myself to the use of the term "Human Nutrition" for the department now called Household Science.[39]

On February 4th, President Campbell wrote to Dr. Morgan that he would recommend to the Board of Regents on February 12th, the renaming of the Department, and that the name change should to take effect on July 1, 1925.[40] However, on March 4, 1924, Dr. Morgan received another note from President Campbell telling her:

> For various reasons, it seems wiser to me that the title DEPARTMENT OF HOUSEHOLD SCIENCE should not be changed to DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN NUTRITION this year. Perhaps the change can be made a year

---

39 Letter of E. D. Merrill to Pres. Campbell, Jan. 31, 1924.
40 Letter of Pres. Campbell to Dr. Morgan, Feb. 4, 1924.

> later. I know that this decision will bring some disappointment to you, and I regret that fact.[41]

In the meantime, Prof. Carl Schmidt of the Biochemistry Department opposed the name change.[42] The Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station also opposed the name change and reported to the Chairman of the Committee on Courses:

> Mr. Schmidt feels that establishment of a Department of Human Nutrition would lead to serious difficulties, since human nutrition and nutrition in general, is the proper field of biochemistry. From my own work in biochemistry, I think Mr. Schmidt's attitude in this respect is perfectly correct. ... I understand that the proposal has been disapproved for the present, and I am confident that it will not be entertained in the future without due consideration.[43]

Dr. Morgan was never content with the name household science, or home economics. At various occasions throughout her life she remarked about the inappropriate name of the field. At a speech delivered at a joint meeting of the Experiment Station and the Home Economics Research Section of the Agriculture and Home Economics Divisions of the Association of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at Washington in 1948 she stated:

> The name Home Economics in some ways is an inadequate and misleading one. The early connotation with cooking and sewing instruction

---

41 Letter from Pres. Campbell to Dr. Morgan, March 4, 1924.
42 Dr. Morgan claimed that he envied her for being advanced to full professor ahead of him. "As soon as he heard about my professorship he became incensed and went to see David Barrows, and had a long controversy with him about it and the next year he got his professorship." Morgan, "Oral History", *op.cit.*, p. 50.
43 Letter of R. Clausen to Prof. Peterson, April 11,1924.

> has lingered erroneously in many minds, even in those of our learned colleagues.[44]

In 1953, in an article published in the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors she wrote:

> There is some discontent with the name, Home Economics, for this cluster of subjects. It is incorrect and misleading. ... Various suggestions have been made as to the desired new name. ... An entomologist remarked gleefully that it is too bad the zoologists and entomologists have snapped up Ecology, since "Human Ecology" might fill the bill.[45]

Even in 1965, in her closing remarks at the symposium honoring her 50th anniversary at the University, she showed how much she was aware of the importance of the name of a field and the connotation it carries with it.

> If we could find some way of adding the word "molecular"to our department name we might be able to command more prestige, funds and followers.[46]

At that time, the left-overs of the former Department of Home Economics were joined together with Food Science and Technology, including the marine food science laboratory of the Institute of Marine Resources. In 1960, the newly organized Department headed by Dr. George Briggs was finally called Nutritional Science; a name Dr. Morgan would have liked from the very beginning, but was unable to attain during her reign.

---

44 Speech read before the joint meeting of Experiment Station and Home Economics Research Sections of the Agriculture and Home Economics Divisions of the Association of the Land-Grant Colleges and Universities at Washington, D. C. Nov. 8,1948, p.1.
45 Morgan, "A New Look," *op.cit.*, p.263.
46 Morgan, "Closing Remarks," *op.cit.*, p.68.

With the change in departmental name came also a change of the name of the building. The new chair, Professor George Briggs, hired to reorganize the Department of Home Economics into a Department of Nutritional Science, requested immediately a name change of the building. He suggested to call the "Home Economics Building" Morgan Hall. While recognizing on the one hand Dr. Morgan's outstanding contribution in the field of nutrition, it was, on the other hand, a tactical move to appease the home economics community in California, who was outraged at the elimination of home economics at Berkeley. It was also a move to get rid of a name inappropriate for Berkeley and for men specifically.

> It now becomes very urgent that the building be re-named, effective as soon as possible, as an important aid to the establishment and public acceptance of the revised "Department of Nutritional Sciences," as we are expected to be called. As you know, all other divisions of the field of home economics are leaving this campus on July 1, or sooner. ... In addition, naming the building after Dr. Morgan will do much to help soothe the many Home Economics forces in this State, who have regretted the moving of the other divisions of home economics to the Davis Campus. It will make the transition much easier. Dr. Morgan, as you know, was Chairman of the Department from 1918 to 1954, and has an international reputation as a nutritionist and home economist.[47]

The moment a man was put in charge of the department, the name home economics became an embarrassment. George Briggs explained to the Dean of Natural Resources:

---

47 Letter of G. Briggs to Chancellor E. Strong, Oct. 6, 1961.

> This urgency is necessary because the present name is not only outdated and not indicative of the change in emphasis to nutrition, but at times the old name has actually proven embarrassing. As an example of the latter, we are soon to present an application to the U.S. Public Health Service for matching grants for construction of the nutrition laboratories in this building. Our chances of getting this grant would be very slim indeed if it were indicated on the application that this is called a "Home Economics Building."[48]

On March 22, 1962, the University celebrated the dedication of the building to Morgan Hall. This was the first, and still is the only building on campus named after a woman who was recognized because of her own academic achievements and not because she donated money to the University.

This day must have been surely a day of triumph in Agnes Fay Morgan's life. But it was also a slap in her face. When Dr. Morgan requested the name of her Department to be changed to nutrition, it was rejected. She had to live for 36 years with the names Household Science and Home Economics. However, when a man requested that the name be changed, it was accepted. The reorganized Department of Nutritional Science in 1960 kept all the areas which Dr. Morgan had developed: nutrition, foods and dietetics. It got rid of those areas which the state Department of Education requested the Department to offer: training of teachers in home economics and of home economics extension

---

48 Letter of G. Briggs to Dean E. Linsley, Jan.9, 1961.

workers. But perhaps in her 70s Agnes Fay Morgan had developed a thick enough skin and could undividedly enjoy her dream of a department of nutrition that finally became true. It just did not happen under her leadership.

The Graduate Group In Nutrition

Very early on, Dr. Morgan realized that a Ph.D program academically carries the most weight. It became her aim to lead her students to a successful completion of a Ph.D. in nutrition. This was not easly undertaken; however, eventually she succeeded in it.

Once she realized that she would not succeed in turning her department into a nutrition department, she actively participated in setting up an interdepartmental graduate group in nutrition which consisted of such fields as biochemistry, physiology, anatomy, medicine, and also household science. This group was chaired by Dr. Carl. L. Schmidt, Professor of Biochemistry from 1930 until 1946. In the early days the official name of the group was Animal Nutrition, reflecting the men's research emphasis in the field.

What Dr. Morgan was not able to establish for her own department she managed to establish in this round-about-way. The difficulties were great. But her seemingly endless

energy and her fighting spirit helped her to overcome many barriers. Ruth Okey remembered these difficulties in her biographical sketch on A. F. Morgan.

> Nutrition is a broad subject and there were a few senior staff members in related departments who were opposed to a program for graduate degrees under the direction of faculty members in Household Science, and especially by women. Their opposition took the form of insisting on the addition of extra last minute requirements for admission to candidacy to an unreasonable degree.[49]

For example, the first Household Science student, Statie Erikson, who applied for admission to candidacy for the Ph.D. in 1924, had to meet with a special Provisional Subcommittee that would test her fitness for such candidacy. Although Miss Erikson had fulfilled all necessary requirements the Dean of the Graduate Division, Charles Lipman felt:

> There seems to be a lack of fundamental training, perhaps in chemistry, and a lack of the original attitude toward scientific problems in the case of Miss Erikson which makes this special procedure with regard to her admission to candidacy necessary.... While we recognize the extra amount of work involved in such task, we feel that we are doing it in the interests of the standards of the university...[50]

This Subcommittee consisted of Professors Morgan and Okey from Household Science, Burnett from Physiology, Porter from Chemistry, and Schmidt and Sundstroem from Biochemistry. During its meeting with the student the faculty from Biochemistry questioned "whether or not the thesis problem was a sufficiently definite one that positive results could

---

49 Okey, "Morgan," *op.cit.*, p. 1104.
50 Letter of Ch. Lipman to A. F. Morgan, Aug. 27, 1924.

be assured with another year's work." Since Professor Burnett left the meeting before it finished, the positive votes of the Professors Porter, Morgan and Okey, were not enough to have the student passed.[51] Statie Erikson was asked to come back in six months with a more definite thesis outline. Dr. Morgan protested about the outcome in a letter to Dean Lipman:

> I believe that a serious injustice is being done the candidate by the discouraging and unnecessary delay here brought about, and I must confess that Miss Okey and I are both alarmed and incensed by the attitude of certain of our colleagues toward our research program.[52]

Indeed discouraged, the student left Berkeley to take up a faculty position at the University of Kentucky in the Department of Home Economics. In 1930, she completed her dissertation and passed successfully her orals. Statie Erikson later became Professor and Dean of Home Economics at the University of Kentucky.

This was not the only student who experienced difficulties. In 1930, the completed dissertation of Gladys Anderson was rejected by the Administrative Committee of the Graduate Council. Doubtful of the quality of her work, the Committee had given her work to a referee, Prof. Carl Schmidt of Biochemistry. He wrote a devastating critique of her thesis.

---

51 Report on Proposed Candidacy of Miss Statie E. Erikson for the Ph.D. degree. Sept. 4, 1924.
52 Letter of A. F. Morgan to Dean Lipman, Sept. 8, 1924.

> The problems presented involve a great deal of labor such as preparation of food, care and feeding of animals and if adequately carried out, an enormous amount of analytical work. In the writer's opinion, such problems really constitute material for a project requiring the cooperation of several individuals rather than a suitable subject for a beginner in the field of research. Adequate direction would have restricted the candidate's activities to a small portion of this very large and difficult problem.[53]

Such a critique was not taken easily by Dr. Morgan. She forcefully replied that the remark about the project requiring the cooperation of several individuals "indicates clearly a misunderstanding of the distinction between a problem and a project. What the critic means is that the question attacked is a fundamental one of great importance and is not concerned only with a small detail of a relatively minor problem."[54] She countered:

> In spite of the vague dislike here expressed of our attacking fundamental problems this department must continue this type of research. Small problems slavishly copied from contributions made elsewhere may appear to be safe but are not appealing nor inevitable. We should prefer to withdraw entirely from the research field rather than accept such puerile limitations.[55]

Gladys Anderson, later Emerson, received her degree in 1932 and became Professor and chair of the Home Economics Department at the University of California at Los Angeles.

---

53 Letter of Dean Lipman to G. Anderson, Dec. 3, 1930.
54 Letter of A. F. Morgan to Dean Lipman, Dec. 15, 1930.
55 *Ibid.*

After this event Dr. Morgan tried two further strategies. First she tried to have Professor Schmidt exchanged for another eminent biochemist.

> We beg to relieve us from further annoyance by refraining from appointing Professor Schmidt upon thesis committees from this department. The service of professors from different departments should be reciprocal in this work to be wholesome and this has not been the case between this and biochemistry. [56]

However this strategy proved unsuccessful. Dean Lipman repeated pointedly "that if we went picking committees long enough, we could of course get a committee of such a complexion as would pass any thesis."[57] Her second strategy was to gain control over the program by having their own graduate group in household science. This was of course rejected by most faculty in related areas. Expressing disappointment about the rejection she wrote to the Dean of the Graduate Division.

> We desire to retain control of the programs and the research of those students who apply to us for guidance in their graduate study.... I believe, however, that the staff of this department is competent to judge the fitness of candidates and to guide their studies and to be accorded full autonomy in the matter. [58]

The Department never became autonomous. The doctoral students always had to be examined by an interdepartmental group, and their thesis always were evaluated by outside faculty. However, Dr. Morgan came up with other ideas to

---

56 Letter of A. F. Morgan to Dean Lipman, Dec. 20, 1930.
57 Letter of Dean Lipman to A. F. Morgan, Jan. 26, 1931.
58 Letter of A.F. Morgan to Dean Lipman, October, 31, 1932.

come closer to her aim of gaining more control of the program. She devised a new procedure for the qualifying examination of the nutrition candidates. The examination was to be held in two parts, a written and an oral examination. Each member of the committee would submit one question for the written examination. The answers would be circulated among all members of the committee prior to the oral examination. This procedure was well received by the members of the interdepartmental Nutrition Group, and by the Graduate Division as well. In fact, other graduate groups, such as Comparative Biochemistry and Comparative Physiology adopted a similar procedure soon after.

Dr. Morgan's' last move was to be nominated director of the Graduate Group itself. From 1946 until her retirement in 1954 she stayed head of this group. During her administration the name was changed from Animal Nutrition to Nutrition in 1949. The group then consisted of thirty-seven faculty members from three campuses, from Berkeley (21), Davis (11), and San Francisco (5). In 1949, there were 18 graduate students enrolled, fourteen of them were candidates for the Ph.D.

Altogether, between 1930 and 1962, thirty-one home economics students earned a Ph.D.s in Nutrition and 125 Master's degrees were also awarded. Most of Dr. Morgan's and Dr. Okey's doctoral students became professors of food science

and nutrition at major universities such as Cornell, Hawaii, Iowa State, Minnesota, Southern California, Tennessee, and the University of California at Los Angeles, Davis, and Berkeley.[59]

If the Department would have been judged against the criteria of employment of graduate students, the Department status should have been very high. But this never happened.

Visibility

Dr. Morgan, as one of the very few female department chairs of a major coeducational research university, became very visible. She was an active member of twenty-one professional organizations and contributed articles to many of the organizations' newsletters. Alone on the Berkeley campus she belonged to six organizations including local chapters of national societies: the Women's Faculty Club, the Prytaneans, the Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Nu (Honor Home Economics Society), Alpha Nu (University of California Nutrition Society), and the Berkeley chapter of the American Association of University Professors. Although these organizations were mainly woman's organizations, she was also known by the men on campus.

---

59 Morgan, "Closing remarks," *op. cit.*, p. 66; G. Emerson, *op.cit.*, p.7; Okey, "Morgan," *op.cit.*, p.1104; a list of all the names, dissertation titles, and year of degree awarded is attached to the "History of Nutrition and Home Economics at UCB, 1914-1962 written by A. F. Morgan.

By participating in the interdepartmental Graduate Group in Nutrition of which she eventually became director she became visible among the male colleagues in related disciplines. In addition she served on many important administrative committees. However, she was never appointed to the most powerful committee, the budget committee. Through these administrative activities she created a name for herself. It was not always a very likeable one. Because she spoke out, perhaps more than was expected of woman, she was remembered by male administrators on campus as a "bitch,"[60] as an "aggressive woman" who "knew black and knew white, but she didn't know much about shades of grey," while "most of us have to deal with greys."[61]

Outside the campus she made a name for herself by giving many talks for community events, speaking on the radio, publishing widely in a variety of journals, and presenting her research results at many conferences. For example, in 1935, she presented a research paper at the International Physiological Congress at Leningrad. In 1936 she presented research reports before the Society for Experimental Biology and Medicine, the American Association for Advancement of Science, the American Chemical Society,

---

60 One of the interviewed male administrators when asked to describe Dr. Morgan told a story where others referred to her her calling her a "bitch."
61 Interview Clark Kerr, March 1985.

the American Society of Biological Chemists, and the American Public Health Association.[62]

Mostly, she gained a reputation and recognition for her service as a member of the Council of the American Institute of Nutrition (1934), as member of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy of Land-Grant Colleges, and as the first women member of the Committee of Nine to administer cooperative research funds of state Agricultural Experiment Stations (1946-1950).

Once she gained outside recognition for her basic research, and her "distinguished service to chemistry" by being awarded the Garvan Medal of the American Chemistry Society in 1949 -- although an award for women chemists -- , she became also acknowledged on her own campus.[63] In 1950, the Academic Senate of the University of California at Berkeley elected her Faculty Research Lecturer for the academic year of 1950-51. This was the first time in the history of the Berkeley campus that a woman was nominated for this honor which is annually given to a Berkeley faculty member "who distinguished himself by scholarly research in

---

62 Annual Report to Household Science to the President, 1936, p.7.

63 The Garvan Medal was established in 1935 by Francis P. Garvan as an award for a distinguished <u>woman</u> chemist. Without this specific compensatory award for women, none of the women's contribution in chemistry would have been publicized at all. See Rossiter for more detail, *op.cit.* p.308-312.

his chosen field of study."[64] This honor, established under President Wheeler in 1913 has been given until today only to two other women faculty members, Professor Josephine Miles, in English in 1976, and Professor Elizabeth Colson in Anthropology in 1982-83.

For the award celebration Dr. Morgan had to give a talk on her research. Dr. Josephine Smith, for many years a budget officer on campus, remembered this celebration.

> Dr. Morgan was the first one [Faculty research Lecturer]. She was very concerned. I knew Dr. Morgan very well. Although she had often given reports personally to the Regents, and even several times exhibits of her nutrition research she said she had nightmares before the lecture. She thought how awful it would be if nobody came. She was very much on pins and needles, but when the time came there was an overflow audience.[65]

Even so late in her career Morgan did not really dare counting on campus recognition.

In 1959, after her retirement, and winning some more prestigious awards, such as the Borden Award from the American Institute of Nutrition, she received the LLD. degree, the honorary Doctor of Law degree, from the University of California. At that time, a definite decision was made that the Department of Home Economics, as Agnes Fay Morgan had built it, would disappear from the campus. For the rest of the women on campus this came as a blow.

---

64 Historical Statement, The Annual Faculty Research Lecturer, Academic Senate.
65 Oral History of the Women's Faculty Club, *op.cit.*, p.4

Josephine Miles, the second woman who was elected Faculty Research Lecturer remembered it:

> Agnes Fay Morgan, by the way, was a real big shot in all this. When Agnes Fay Morgan retired, whappo, nothing was left of her empire. They wiped it out and sent it up to Davis. Even though in the committee I was on, everybody supported the keeping of it here, we woke up the next year to find it was gone.[66]

Dr. Morgan clearly tried every possibility to raise the status of the department. However, every strategy she tried had a specific gendered edge on it. Designing a strong science oriented curriculum she ran into complications with the state Department of Education which demanded more practical teacher training for home economics teachers for secondary schools. The research topics she and her staff chose out of need for text-books, money, space, and research subjects, dealt with problems of women and children. They were need oriented, and less basic oriented than the research topics of men. Being more applied, they carried less prestige with them. Dr. Morgan was also not able to change the name of her Department from "Household Science" to "Nutrition," because then the Department would intrude too much into the territories of accepted men's fields of research. Home Economics was a field for women, and should stay so, or disappear altogether. Women students who majored in home economics were automatically suspected of lacking research originality and analytical skills, as the

66 *Ibid.*, p.109.

early members of the Graduate Group in Animal Nutrition demonstrated. Being outspoken in administrative committees and protesting exceptional treatment, Agnes Fay Morgan was remembered as aggressive, not conciliatory. Finally, the visibility gained by its own space, the home economics building, made other faculty on campus mock about the penthouse for home management training and the Department was again perceived as a trade school department. The vicious cycle would go on.

Home Economics as a department was never allowed to develop much status. Any prestige accumulated by individuals within the Department adhered only to them and was never transferred to the Department as a whole. It was a women's field of study, and as such just not fit into the established hierarchy of academic status, prestige and power. All of Agnes Fay Morgan strategies to raise the departmental status brought recognition to her and her alone.

Gender and Status

Gender and status form a vicious circle. Because they were women, Agnes Fay Morgan and Ruth Okey together with many other women who were similarly trained in chemistry, could not find employment in departments of chemistry or biochemistry. Consequently, they ended up working in home economics departments. Because these women chemists were

employed in home economics departments, they had no access to research money other than funds which were specifically designated for problems concerning food, family, children, and women. Professional associations such as the American Institute of Nutrition and many research universities, however never valued this kind of research.

Given the research produced by the Department and the successful employment of its students, the Department probably would have ranked fairly high in status on the Berkeley campus, had it not been designated for women's work and had it not been dominated by women. However, because it was created explicitly for women, the Department was never able to raise its status. Only its chair, Agnes Fay Morgan gained status and recognition on campus, and only for herself.

I conclude that gender played a crucial role during the life of the Department of Home Economics at Berkeley. The case of home economics at Berkeley demonstrates how significant gender is as a factor in ranking academic departments.